

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 24, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-4 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0140757 (Tyan) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,888,305 (Weaver). Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tyan, Weaver and U.S. Patent No. 4,434,010 (Ash) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0044035 (Morii) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0017517 (Yamazaki). Further, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tyan, Weaver, Ash and U.S. Patent No. 6,278,237 (Campos).

It is believed that whenever Tyan is referred to, the intended reference is U.S. Patent No. 6,406,801 (Tokito), since Tyan is not prior art to the present application, and the body of the

rejections correctly refer Tokito, and not Tyan. Clarification is requested. In the following remarks, it is assumed that Tokito is the intended reference, and not Tyan.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 3-4 and 6-18 are patentable over Tokito, Weaver, Ash, Morii, Yamazaki and Campos for at least the following reasons.

As correctly noted on pages 2-4 of the Final Office Action, Tokito and Weaver do not disclose or suggest that the material of the transparent layers having the high refractive index comprise  $\text{SnO}_2$ . Ash is cited to show  $\text{ZnS}$  and  $\text{MgF}_2$ , but Ash does not disclose or suggest  $\text{SnO}_2$  as a material for the transparent layers having the high refractive index, as recited in independents claim 1 and 4.

It is respectfully submitted that Tokito, Weaver, Ash, and combinations thereof do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 4 which, amongst other patentable elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided):

An electroluminescent device comprising ... a cathode electrode and  $2n+1$  transparent dielectric layers directly on said cathode electrode ... which transparent dielectric layers alternately have a high refractive index of  $n > 1.7$  and a low refractive index of  $n < 1.7$  ... wherein the transparent layers having the

high refractive index comprise  $\text{SnO}_2$ .

Morii, Yamazaki and Campos are cited to allegedly show other features and do not cure the noted deficiencies in Tokito, Weaver and Ash.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 4 are patentable over Tokito, Weaver, Morii and combinations thereof and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 3 and 6-18 respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 4 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.


For example (illustrative emphasis added) "wherein the  $2n+1$  transparent dielectric layers are configured to generate light having transmission peaks that lie in wavelength ranges of red, green and blue colors" recited in claim 13 is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Tokito, Weaver, Ash, Morii, Yamazaki, Campos and combinations thereof. Rather, Weaver merely recites on column 3, lines 9-10, "that the quarter-wave stack is tuned to transmit light

at a peak wavelength within the range of wavelengths emitted by the OLED." (Emphasis added) It is respectfully submitted that a disclosure of tuning to transmit light at a single peak wavelength does not teach or suggest "dielectric layers are configured to generate light having transmission peaks that lie in wavelength ranges of red, green and blue colors," as recited in claim 13. (Emphasis added)

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
March 17, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101